

REMARKS

At the outset, the Applicant would like to thank Examiner Vaughn for the courtesy shown during the telephone interview of November 10, 2005. Numerous issues were discussed as highlighted in the memo that Applicant faxed to Examiner Vaughn prior to the interview. One notable suggestion made by Examiner Vaughn was that the manner in which the disk drive and CPU housings are mechanically coupled in the subject invention should be explicitly stated in the claims to distinguish over the sliding connection disclosed in the Ayd patent, US 6025989. Although Applicant believes that the previous changes to the independent claims already distinguished the claims over Ayd, further changes have now been made in accordance with Examiner Vaughn's suggestion in an effort to place the application in condition for allowance.

Although the Ayd patent discloses a modular computer system, the structure differs substantially from the subject invention. In Ayd's system, a removable chassis 14 is connected to a logic chassis 12. The logic chassis 12 includes the CPU and other logic cards, while the removable chassis includes a power module, cooling fan and multiple disk drives. In contrast and as Applicant noted during the interview, the key feature of the subject invention is that a CPU subsystem is directly mated to a single disk drive and includes a housing that is substantially of the same height and width of this single disk drive's housing. This arrangement enables a complete sever formed of the CPU subsystem and the disk drive to be inserted into a single disk drive bay of a conventional PC housing or the like. In contrast and contrary to the assertions made in the Office Action, the removable chassis 14 in Ayd is not a disk drive housing, but is a chassis that itself supports 2 disk drive housings, as well as a number of other components.

To emphasize the foregoing distinctions and clearly define the invention over Ayd, independent claims 1, 8 and 15 have hereby been further amended to specify that the CPU

subsystem housing includes at least one ear that extends from one end and is secured to the disk drive housing by using a fastener means. Clearly, even if the chassis 14 in Ayd was a disk drive housing, Ayd discloses that the two chassis are slidably coupled together such that one is readily removable from the other. This is not the case in the claimed invention in which the disk drive housing and CPU housing are mechanically secured to one another with screws or the like. As a result, claims 1, 8 and 15 as amended are clearly patentable over Ayd and the other references of record.

Further, Applicant would like to reiterate the point that the chassis 14 in Ayd is not a disk drive housing, but is a chassis that supports 2 disk drives and other components, as clearly illustrated. From the disclosure in Ayd, it is clear that the CPU housing is much larger in cross section than a disk drive housing and is not approximately the same height and width as the disk drive housing as recited in the claims. In addition, the claims also recite that electrical connectors are provided in each housing that mate to one another so that power and/or data can be fed between the CPU subsystem and the disk drive without the need for external cabling. Clearly, Ayd does not disclose or suggest such an arrangement in which a single disk drive is mated to a CPU subsystem. Instead, Ayd discloses a CPU subsystem that is mated to a logic chassis, in which are disposed numerous items including two disk drives and their housings. The CPU subsystem is coupled to the removable chassis, not to one of the disk drives. For these reasons as well, the claims are patentable and allowable over Ayd and the other references of record.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of independent claims as amended 1, 8 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Ayd in view of Obara, is overcome. For the same reasons, the various other rejections of the dependent claims that are set

forth in numbered paragraphs 10-16 of the Office Action are also overcome. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By: William A. Blake
William A. Blake
Reg. No. 30,548
(filed under 37 C.F.R. 1.34)

JONES, TULLAR & COOPER, P.C.
P.O. Box 2266, Eads Station
Arlington, VA. 22202
(703) 415-1500
Dated: December 22, 2005